

REMARKS

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9-12, 15-17, 23, 25, and 38-51 are pending in the present application. Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16 and 38 stand rejected by the Examiner; Claims 3, 9, 10, 17, and 39 are objected to by the Examiner; and Claims 23, 25, and 40-51 are allowed. The applicants have canceled Claims 2, 4, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 38. The Applicants have added Claims 86-92. As such, Claims 3, 9, 10, 17, 23, 25, 39-51 and 86-92 are presently pending.

Applicants note that all amendments and cancellations of Claims presented herein are made without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's arguments or rejections, and solely for the purpose of expediting the patent application process in a manner consistent with the PTO's Patent Business Goals (PBG),¹ and without waiving the right to prosecute the amended or cancelled Claims (or similar Claims) in the future.

In the present Office Action, the Examiner made a number of arguments, objections, and rejections. The Examiner has rejected Claims 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 38 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Asseline et al. (Asseline et al., J. Biol. Chem. Pgs. 8936-8941, [1985]) (Office Action, pg. 2). The Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. However, in order to further the business interests of the Applicants and while reserving the right to prosecute the original (or similar) claims in the future, the Applicants have cancelled Claims 2, 6, 7, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 38. As such, the rejection is moot.

The Examiner has objected to Claims 3, 9, 10, 17 and 39 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 3, 9, 10, 17, and 39 have been rewritten as independent claims including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims, or as dependent on such claims. As such, the Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn and the claims be allowed. The Applicants have added new Claims 86-92. Claims 86-92 are dependent on rewritten Claim 9, which the Examiner has deemed allowable. As such, Claims 86-92 should be allowed.

¹ 65 Fed. Reg. 54603 (Sept. 8, 2000).

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

CONCLUSION

All grounds of rejection and objection of the Office Action of June 27, 2003 having been addressed, reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that the Claims should be allowed. Should the Examiner have any questions, or if a telephone conference would aid in the prosecution of the present application, Applicant encourages the Examiner to call the undersigned collect at 608-218-6900.

Dated: July 28, 2003



David A. Casimir
Reg. No. 42,395

MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP
101 Howard Street, Suite 350
San Francisco, California 94105
(608) 218-6900

BEST AVAILABLE COPY